

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. ABC 3309 6- 463,007 **EXAMINER** ROBERT G. MUKAI BOCKÉLMAN, M **ART UNIT** PAPER NUMBER P.O. BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404 3306 11 03/10/97 DATE MAILED: This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Responsive to communication filed on 12-5-96 This action is made final. This application has been examined ______ month(s), ____ days from the date of this letter. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire ____ Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133 Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: 2. Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. 1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
6. 3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. 5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION /- 17_____are pending in the application. 1. Claims are withdrawn from consideration. Of the above, claims 2. Claims /8 have been cancelled. 3. Claims 4. Claims 5. Claims __ are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement. 7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action. _. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings 9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _ are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948). 10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on ____ examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation). _____, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation). 11. The proposed drawing correction, filed ____ 12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received □ been filed in parent application, serial no. ______; filed on _____ 13. Since this application apppears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other

Serial No. 463,904 Art Unit 3306

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Weaver '034 in view of Sibalis '892 or Levy et al.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Phipps et al U.S. Patent '739 in view of Phipps et al 5,125,894.

Phipps et al '739 teaches the delivery of Fentanyl and sufentanil substantially as claimed. As it was desired in the art to maintain a linear relationship between current and dosage, it would have been obvious to experiment to determine values of fentanyl and sufentanil which are above the threshold level for such linearity and to maintain it above such a level for the desired period of delivery.

Applicant's arguments filed 12-5-96 have been fully considered

Serial No. 463,904 Art Unit 3306

but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

The examiner disagrees with applicants position that the references would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the claimed invention. The applicant provides no evidence that the desire to achieve such linearity would not between delivery rate and current coincide with the claimed invention.

As far as the rejection based upon Weaver and Sibalis or Levy, applicant's claims would cover methods of electroporation. Applicant demonstrates no criticality for a purely electroporation method. To have delivered sufentani or Fentanyl by electroporation at various concentrations including those claimed would have been an obvious design choice.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Serial No. 463,904 Art Unit 3306

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark Bockelman at telephone number (703) 308-2112.

Mark Bockelman:bhw March 5, 1997

Mark Bockelman Primary Examiner Group 3300